

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

URIEL MARCUS, BENEDICT
VERCELES, and Others Similarly
Situating,

No. C 14-03824 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFFS'
DEPOSITIONS**

APPLE INC,


Defendant.

Two weeks ago, the parties were ordered to conduct limited discovery on the safety issue presented in defendant's motion to dismiss. Plaintiffs were ordered to sit for depositions by March 31, 2015, and to produce their operating manuals and all paperwork that came with their units, including receipts, at least forty hours before their depositions (Dkt. No. 67).

Now, four days before their depositions were ordered to be completed, plaintiffs have filed a motion stating that their depositions are unnecessary and in the alternative, have asked for a thirty-day extension to complete their depositions. This is the third time plaintiffs have requested an extension in this case. Plaintiffs' depositions shall be completed by **APRIL 3, 2015**. All other dates contained in the March 16 order remain in place (Dkt. No. 67). No more extensions will be granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2015.


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE